

Reply-To: bu.edu!INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL
Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #953
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Thu, 30 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 953

Today's Topics:

ECPA (was: Military aircraft callsi
FT727R mods wanted
My backyard, your backyard ...
PRO 34 Mod Problems/Info
Right to privacy (verdict handed down)
RS Discone? To buy or not to buy?
Scanning food service
The "right to receive" (2 msgs)

Date: 30 Nov 89 17:05:54 GMT
From: microsoft!clayj@uunet.uu.net (Clay Jackson)
Subject: ECPA (was: Military aircraft callsi
Message-ID: <9215@microsoft.UUCP>

- 1) I don't really have the time.
- 2) According to the local FCC folk (I checked), UNLESS they're getting into some "real" device, instead of just a "part 15" device, the FCC could care less.

If you want some interesting reading sometime, read the Part 15 rules about things like portable phones and baby monitors (and garage door openers, and the new RF remote light controllers from X10 and, and....). Basically, it says that the device "must accept" interference from any and all other sources, and that if a part 15 device is interfering with another device, it's the part 15 device's problem.

However, I do happen to know a guy who's fairly high up in the McCaw organization (he's in a class I'm attending), and if I see him again, I'll probably just mention it in passing.

Clay

Date: 30 Nov 89 18:54:00 GMT
From: mailrus!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!srcsip!nic.MR.NET!sun1!bmc@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Bruce Cameron)
Subject: FT727R mods wanted
Message-ID: <1778@nic.MR.NET>

Hi,

A while back someone posted info for mods for the Pro 34. My results differ from what was expected. I wanted to restore the 66-88 MHZ band. (Why?, so I could hear if someone was using an R.C. plane on the same channel as my R.C. plane) Adding Diode 9 restored 68-88 (thats right 68 not 66). However I lost 30-54. Also, even though the display indicated 68-88 I don't think my scanner was actually receiving anything. I turned on my R.C. and it didn't pick it up. I have a PRO 2005 and it picks up the R.C. in all modes: AM, NFM, WFM. (The R.C. transmits in AM). I removed Diode 9.

The Cellular coverage restoration works fine

The Author talks about a Diode 13, I believe he was confused here. He states Diode 13 is not installed, but it is. The problem is that he saw the number 13 near the diode bank 9 thru 12. The number 13 is the pin number for the I.C. nearby. All for corners of the I.C. have the pin numbers silk screened on the board.

I played with Diode 12, and didn't figure out its purpose.

Anyone else care to comment??

BTW I'm I posting to the right group, or should I be posting the shortwave group??? I don't really see a difference between the two.

Glen Stone

Date: 29 Nov 89 17:27:37 GMT
From: oliveb!mipos3!pcocd2!jmasters@apple.com (Justin Masters ~)
Subject: Right to privacy (verdict handed down)
Message-ID: <1296@mipos3.intel.com>

I read in the paper this morning that a judge had stated that videotaping of a sex act without the knowledge of the other is a violation of privacy, since the sex act is considered an act of communication.

I didn't read the article too well, since I don't videotape my activities (I can get a replay any time ;)).

Is my car the only one in America where | Justin "Ice Cream Monster" Masters
someone breaks in and turns up my radio |
every time I park? - Steven Wright | jmasters@fmdgr1.intel.com

Date: 30 Nov 89 14:53:31 GMT
From: rti!alex@mcnc.org (George Ph. Alexiou)
Subject: RS Discone? To buy or not to buy?
Message-ID: <3296@rti.UUCP>

Give us a few details about the construction of this antenna...
Thanks.
g.

Date: Thu, 30 Nov 89 17:03:57 EDT
From: "Mike Owen, W9IP" <MROWEN%STLAWU.BITNET@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU>
Subject: Scanning food service

Regarding the earlier, exhaustive posting regarding
food service frequencies:

For crying out loud, WHO CARES?

Date: 30 Nov 89 15:56:06 GMT
From: rochester!ray@louie.udel.edu (Ray Frank)
Subject: The "Right to Receive"
Message-ID: <1989Nov30.155606.16599@cs.rochester.edu>

In article <8911280003.AA13222@apg-tecnet.apg.army.mil> mgb@APG-
TECNET.APG.ARMY.MIL writes:

>*The "crime" is invasion of privacy".

> ^^^^^ ^^ ^^

>*Let me say that I am all for freedom of speech and action, where it does

>*not interfere with my right to privacy.

> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Using a cordless phone or a cellular phone is like having a conversation at the
top of your lungs with your neighbor down the street and then getting

pissed because others heard the conversation. The constitution does not provide for the protection of those who insist on doing stupid things. If I heard the conversation I suppose the loud mouth would have insisted that I close my doors and windows where upon I would have suggested that the real solution would have been for him to keep his mouth closed. By the way, I missed the posting that gave the freqs. for security in stores. Could someone repost these for me.

thanks

ray

Date: Thu, 30 Nov 89 14:24 EST
From: Ed Schwalenberg <Ed@ALDERAAN.SCRC.Symbolics.COM>
Subject: The "right to receive"
Message-ID: <19891130192436.9.ED@PEREGRINE.SCRC.Symbolics.COM>

Date: 30 Nov 89 01:58:26 GMT
From: cadnetix.COM!cadnetix!rusty@uunet.uu.net (Rusty Carruth)

In article <19891121181318.6.ED@PEREGRINE.SCRC.Symbolics.COM>
Ed@ALDERAAN.SCRC.SYMBOLICS.COM (Ed Schwalenberg) writes:

...lots of discussions about receiving transmissions not intended for you...
...(its a long thread, go see it in your local rec.ham-radio archive
... if you really *must* see it)...

>Governments have the unlimited right, which they have exercised in the past

I'm not sure how to reply to this statement without becoming inflammatory, lets just go with: The above opinion depends a whole bunch upon your philosophy of politics, governments, where rights come from in the first place (which is actually a religious issue (oops, here come the flames!)), and other philosophical/religious/political presuppositions you may have.

Rusty omitted the beginning of my article, where I explained that I didn't think that the "right to receive" was granted by the Constitution or by the Act of '34. A few people sent reasoned, reasonable replies explaining why they thought those documents DID guarantee them a right to receive; I respect those opinions and I hereby thank the people who sent them.

On the other hand, many flammers sent messages of the form "I can do anything I want with radio waves on my property!"; these people aren't about to convince me (or their congressmen) that they have such rights simply because of the exclamatory nature of their sentences.

I didn't and don't want to provoke a philosophical discussion. If you can point to a "right to receive" based on a reasonable understanding of current law, I'm interested; please quote chapter and verse. If your belief in a "right to receive" is based on your personal belief in anarchy or communism or someotherism, or because you think you know what Thomas Jefferson would have thought, or because of the provisions of English property law of the thirteenth century, I think you're just flaming and I'll delete your message as quickly as I can.

I do not believe that the government has unlimited rights. The above statement would indicate that Ed does (but then, he may not).

My statement that governments have unlimited rights in this area is a statement of fact about how governments have acted and continue to act, not a declaration of philosophy. I have carefully avoided posting my opinion of the government and its "rights", under the assumption that everybody out there is as uninterested in my opinion as I am uninterested in theirs.

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #953
